238.1
J57

Gaylord
SPEEDY BINDER
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
2400 RIDGE ROAD
BERKELEY, CA 94709

What Christ Revealed

Rev. LOUIS JOUIN, S.J.

Professor of Ethics, Etc.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, FORDHAM, N. Y.

IMPRIMATUR,
MICHAEL AUGUSTINE,
ARCHBISHOP NEW YORK

Copyright, 1897, by St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y.

PREFACE.

This little book is intended to be a brief but reasoned exposition of the principal doctrines which constitute the faith of a Catholic. It will be of use in the instructions that are given at missions, and will serve as a text-book for colleges and academies. It divides itself into three parts, answering the question implied in the title, "What Christ Revealed," viz., I. The Church that teaches; II. The Creed that is taught; III. The Sacraments that sanctify.

The Commandments are omitted because the book has to do chiefly with doctrine.

944

PART I.

THE CHURCH THAT TEACHES.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THERE IS A CHURCH.

All Christians believe that the Son of God came to teach us the way of salvation and that only He can lead us thither. We must admit that much, if we admit the Bible, for Christ said "I am the way, the truth and the life. No one cometh to the Father but through Me."[1]

Christ teaches through the Apostles.

But now that He is no longer on earth, whose voice is to guide us? Christ has said of His Apostles: "Who heareth you, heareth Me."[2] Therefore it follows that we are to receive the doctrines of Christ through the Apostles. But that means that we are to receive the doctrine of Christ through the Church. For He sent His Apostles to teach all nations to observe whatsoever He had commanded,[3] which was nothing else than commanding them to go and establish the Church throughout the world. So that it comes to this. We are taught the doctrines of Christ which are to lead us to life everlasting through the Church which He sent the Apostles to establish among the nations of the earth.

Voice of Apostles the Voice of the Church.

1. John xiv. 6. 2. Mark x. 16. 3. Matt. xxviii. 20.

We must hear the Church or be lost.

Hence we are not free to refuse to hear that Church. Besides Christ has said: "He who does not hear the Church let him be to you as a heathen and a publican." That means, let such a one be considered a very wicked man. For the publicans were abominated by the Jews and to have anything to do with a heathen was felt to be contamination. In point of fact He made it obligatory under pain of eternal damnation, for He said: "He who does not believe will be damned."[1]

Hence we are not only to believe, but to receive that belief from the Apostles, which means from the Church, or else lose our souls. In other words it is absolutely necessary for our salvation to belong to the Church of Christ.

The Church is visible.

If that is so we ought to be able to find that Church. Hence it ought to be *visible*. In fact, Christ speaks of His Church as a kingdom, a city, a house, etc., implying that just as a kingdom, or a city, or a house is visible, so is the Church.

The Church has marks.

Not only should it be visible but it should have some certain indications or *marks* about it, to make us sure it is Christ's Church, and not one founded by some one else. For we cannot afford to make a mistake in such an important matter.

1. Mark xvi. 16.

CHAPTER II.

MARKS OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

In the first place, the Church which Christ established cannot consist of a number of discordant and warring sects which contradict each other and teach opposite doctrines on the most important matters, but must, on the contrary, be a united body believing and acting alike on matters of religion. Christ wished His people to be "one as He and the Father are one."[1]

Secondly. There ought to be the stamp of holiness upon it. That needs no proof.

Thirdly. It ought to be found everywhere, at all periods of history since the coming of Christ, and include all classes and conditions of men. For the Apostles were sent to teach all nations,[2] and Christ died for all men.[3]

Fourthly. It must be able to trace its origin back to the Apostles, for they were commissioned by Christ to establish the Church.

In other words, the Church of Christ ought to have these four marks, 1. Unity; 2. Holiness; 3. Universality; 4. Apostolicity.

1. John xvii. 22.
2. Matt. xxviii. 20.
3. II. Cor. v. 15.

Now let us try to get a more complete idea of what is meant by these four things.

I.—THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

There ought to be unity in the faith which is taught, unity in the sacraments which are used, and unity in the government which directs the Church.

Christ's Church must have one faith.

Unity in Faith means that there should not be any contradictory doctrines in the Church on matters of faith. That is what St. Paul implies when he says there should be one Lord, one faith, one baptism.[1]

It means that we are not free to pick or choose what suits our fancy and to reject what does not. For Christ commands us under pain of eternal loss to receive His *whole* doctrine.[2]

The Apostle insisted so much on all believing the same thing that he tells the Galatians to curse even an angel who might come from heaven to teach them anything contrary to what the Apostles had taught.[3]

But is not a union of charity and kindly feeling enough? By no means. It is good as far as it goes, but it has to have a foundation of com-

1. Eph. iv. 5.
2. Matt. xxviii.; Mark xvi. 16.
3. Gal. i. 8.

mon faith to start with. Hence St. Paul tells the Ephesians to be careful to keep the unity of spirit in the bond of peace, but to remember that there is one faith and one baptism.[1]

Union in fundamentals not enough.

It is a common thing to hear people say that we ought to establish some kind of Christian unity, because there are certain fundamental doctrines which all admit. Let us take the fundamentals they say, and permit people to do as they choose about the rest. In the first place, they can never be got to agree as to what are fundamental and what are not. And even if they were to agree who could hold them to the belief one moment longer than they wished?

We have no right to choose what pleases.

Moreover suppose a doctrine is not fundamental and yet has been revealed by Christ. Have we a right to reject it? Surely not. If Christ can deceive us on one point He can deceive us on all. We are outside of the Church of Christ unless we receive His *whole* doctrine.

Must have the same sacraments.

Secondly there should be in the Church which Christ has established a *unity in sacraments*. So that, if in one Church there are, let us say, only two sacraments and in another seven, it is clear that both of those churches cannot be the Church of Christ. They are in contradiction with each other. The sacraments are a fundamental part of the divine revelation and to reject any one of

1. Eph. iv. 3.

them is to reject something delivered to the Church by Christ. That is to depart from the faith.

The same government.

Thirdly there must be *unity in government*, for the Church, according to Christ, is a visible kingdom, a household, a city, and a body. But a kingdom is one only inasmuch as it is governed by one authority; a household is one only inasmuch as it is governed by its head; a city because it is presided over by its magistracy, etc. So the Church must be. The members of a moral body, namely of an association, are one only because of the supreme authority which constitutes the bond of union and directs all the associates to a common end.

Even if there were different associations with the same object in view, they could not be considered one society unless they were ruled by one supreme head.

II.—THE HOLINESS OF THE CHURCH.

It must be holy.

The Church of Christ ought to be holy because it was founded by Christ, because its life-giving principle is the Holy Ghost, because it dispenses sacraments which are means of holiness, because its members are made temples of the Holy Ghost, etc.

III.—THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE CHURCH.

It was prophesied of Christ that *all* nations should be blessed in Him.[1] He was the expected of nations.[2] Christ sent His Apostles to all nations and therefore it should be everywhere or universal.

It must exist everywhere.

This does not mean that the Church of Christ should be the most powerful Church body everywhere, but merely that it should be established in so many places that its teaching may reach all. Nothing more is needed to fulfil the condition of universality.

IV.—APOSTOLICITY OF THE CHURCH.

The Church which Christ established ought to be able to trace its history back to the time of the Apostles. If it stops short somewhere, if it begins, for example, a couple of hundred years ago, it cannot claim apostolic origin, especially if its doctrines are quite unlike those taught by the Apostles.

It must go back to the Apostles.

These are the marks that would help us to find the Church which Christ has founded. Now it is not difficult to see that these four marks are found only in what is known as the Catholic Church.

1. Gen. xii. 3.
2. Gen. xlix. 16.

CHAPTER III.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ALONE HAS THE FOUR MARKS OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

I.—ONLY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH HAS UNITY.

She is one in faith, one in sacraments, one in government.

Catholic Church always united.

There is *unity in faith*, for if a Catholic rejects even one single article of her creed, he, by the very fact, ceases to be a Catholic. Besides, she teaches the same doctrine that she taught in the beginning, and she will continue to teach it till the end.

New Dogma not a change.

"No, she does not," say the enemies of the Church. "She has changed her doctrine even in our own day by introducing the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Pope."

To this we answer, you mistake. There is no change. The Church always taught these doctrines, but only solemnly defined them in our day; that is to say, she declared that they were, and always had been, part of her teaching.

We even admit that there may yet be other dogmas still to be defined. The solemn promulgation of them may be called for, either because the doctrine is disputed, and she steps in to

decide ; or because her silence might give rise to error. But that promulgation does not introduce a new truth. It points out an old one.

No sect has unity of sacraments.

We maintain also that no other Church can lay any claim whatever to any kind of unity. Thus only the Catholic Church has always kept the same sacraments. Some sects have two; some one; others none. She alone has the mark of *sacramental unity.*

No unity of government.

As for Protestants, the very principle on which they are founded, viz., the right of private judgment necessarily and immediately creates disunion. The multitude of Protestant sects is evidence of that; and even in each sect there is almost as much diversity of belief as there are individuals. They have *no government at all.*

II.—ONLY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS HOLY.

That is evident.

a) Because any one living up to its precepts will be regarded as a holy person.

Holy in her doctrine.

But are there not upright Protestants? Certainly. But not in virtue of their creed, which lets each one form his own code of morals. Each one does what he thinks right, though he may think very badly at times. A bad Catholic, on the contrary, is living in direct violation of the well-known and clearly promulgated laws of his Church.

In her missions.

b) Only the Catholic Church can convert pagan nations. Fabulous sums of money are spent by Protestant missionaries, but their failure to do anything is notorious.[1] Catholic missionaries have little or no money, and invariably succeed. It is singular that the Greek schismatics never attempted missionary work. The Russians have tried it, but by persecution.

In her religious orders.

c) Only the Catholic Church has religious orders absolutely and for life devoted to self-denial and good works. The Anglican imitations spring from a desire to be Catholic.

In her saints.

d) Only the Catholic Church has saints; that is, people who have lived lives of heroic sanctity, or who have testified to the truth of the faith by martyrdom. In fact, Protestants have an aversion for saints. The title itself is offensive. Even St. Paul is often spoken of as plain 'Paul.' And yet "saint" signifies "holy." Why should they dislike it? It seems like an unwillingness to have this mark of Christ's Church upon them.

Bad origin of Protestantism.

On the other hand, the chief opponents of the Church to-day can lay no claim at all to holiness. Infidelity and atheism cannot, since they reject God altogether. Nor can Protestantism. "A bad tree cannot produce good fruit," Christ tells us. Luther is the bad tree from which Protestantism was produced. Who was Luther? He was an apostate Catholic priest, a bad man in

Luther.

1 Marshall's Missions.

rebellion against the Pope; one who taught the most scandalous and wicked doctrines. Thus, for example, he said: "Good works, instead of helping to salvation, prevent it." Sin, sin all you can; the more the better. "Free will! there is no such thing," etc. His own life was in keeping with his teaching. A bad priest, who married a consecrated nun, would not be called by God to reform morals.

Bad popes.

But there were bad popes. We answer, yes. Out of the two hundred and sixty since St. Peter, there were, unhappily, a few, but they did not found a church, and never taught wicked doctrine.

Calvin.

As Luther, so were most of the other reformers. Thus Calvin made God the author, and yet the punisher of sin. "Those who were confirmed in grace," he said, "could never lose it, no matter what sins they might commit."

Henry VIII.

Henry the Eighth drew England into schism only because the Pope refused to divorce him from his wife. The woman he took in her place, he afterwards beheaded, as well as another wife besides.

Such doctrines and such examples necessarily resulted in unbridled licentiousness all over Europe.

That is the origin of Protestantism; assuredly with no mark of holiness about it. Its conse-

quences will be, and are already, worse still. The general unbelief of to-day is a necessary outcome of Protestantism.

III.—ONLY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS UNIVERSAL.

Catholic means universal.

There is not much difficulty in showing that. The words Catholic and universal mean the same thing, and, singularly enough, no heretical sect ever wanted to be known by the name "Catholic." It is always looked upon as a sort of reproach. Of late, some sects are endeavoring to appropriate it, but without success; and if a stranger were to inquire for the Catholic church, in a city, there is no doubt where he would be sent, even if there were plenty other places with saints' names upon them, and claiming to be Catholic.

Not a national Church.

All churches which are not Catholic, are restricted to some locality or nation, as the English, the Dutch Reformed, the Russian, the Scotch Presbyterian. None of them are universal. The Catholic Church, on the contrary, is found in all parts of the world, has existed in all times since the Christian era began, and includes in its fold all conditions of society.

Rome a centre, not a nation.

But, they object, it is called the *Roman* Catholic Church! Is not that restricting it to one place? To that we answer, no. Rome is the

centre from which its influence radiates through the entire world. It is *not a nation* within whose limits its religious teaching is restricted.

IV.—ONLY THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS APOSTOLIC.

The easiest way to show that is to open any book of history and trace the unbroken line of chief bishops, from Leo XIII. up to St. Peter. Only the Catholic Church can do that. In fact most Protestant sects have no bishops at all and consequently cannot pretend to Apostolic succession. Apostolic succession means the transmission of authority or jurisdiction from the Apostles. If there are no longer any bishops there is no longer any succession. If the government of a nation is overthrown and everyone does as he likes, it is clear there is no succession of governmental authority.

Line of popes back to Peter.

Even if there are validly consecrated bishops, as in the Greek schismatical Church, there is no apostolical succession, for they lost that when they broke from the centre of unity from which all jurisdiction or right to govern is derived. In England they neither have a right to govern nor valid consecration.

Apostolic succession.

But what about the time when there were two or three who were claiming to be Pope? Was not the apostolic succession broken then in the Catho-

Anti-popes.

lic Church? Not at all. One of them had the right to be Pope. It was only a temporary doubt as to which was the rightful claimant.

Pope Joan.

Again it is said there was a woman who was pope, the famous Pope Joan. She could not have been pope and the apostolic succession was surely broken then. To that we answer that the story of Pope Joan is a fable, with no historical foundation whatever.

The conclusion from all this is that the Catholic Church is the Church of Christ. It alone has the four marks upon it which establish its claim.

People in good faith.

What about those who are convinced of the contrary? If they are baptized and sincere they are Catholics at heart and are not wilfully outside the Church. Their ignorance may save them.

But am I not safe if I do what I think is right? That would not be a safe course for a ship, much less for a soul. I ought to be sure.

Catholics are sure they are right and all others wrong. Hence they do not read heretical works. That would imply a doubt of their faith.

CHAPTER IV.

OTHER ATTRIBUTES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

ARTICLE I.

INDEFECTIBILITY.

Since the Catholic Church is the Church of Christ it follows that it can never cease to exist. That is what is meant by the word indefectibility. Christ has promised that "He would build His Church on Peter and that the gates of hell should never prevail against her."[1] Consequently not only can it never cease to be but it can never fall into heresy or idolatry. If it could then the gates of hell would have prevailed and Christ's promise would be void. To assert that, would be blasphemy.

No reformation of doctrine.

It follows, therefore, that the Church can never stand in need of a reformation in her doctrine. Otherwise we would suppose that she had fallen into error, that Christ did not abide with her, and that the Holy Ghost no longer guided her. None of which can be admitted by any who believe the Bible.

1. Matt. xvi. 18.

Church never wholly corrupt.

If at any time a reform was needed it was not a reform in doctrine, but a reform in morals, and that reformation would not be of the Church nor of the generality of her members.

Luther's wickedness could not reform her.

A certain number of Bishops and priests as well as of the laity have indeed from time to time become lax in their manner of life and needed to be brought back to the practice of virtue and piety. But that could never be done as was pretended in the Reformation of the 16th century, by having Luther and his associates break away from the Church altogether, by denying her doctrine and becoming worse than those whom they condemned.

The period of the Reformation had great saints.

Reformation of morals is continually going on within the Church. Holy men are continually exhorting the faithful, and it is remarkable that the number of illustrious saints who appear in the Church is greatest at those dreadful epochs in her history. The time of Luther was the time also of St. Ignatius, St. Francis Xavier, St. Vincent de Paul, St. Francis of Sales and a multitude of others.

Persecution of the Church.

Again, besides these great convulsions within, the Church has from the beginning been subject to the most terrible persecutions from without. Over and over again her downfall has been predicted, but she is stronger to-day than ever. On the other hand all the various sects that have

arisen against her are practically dead. Protestantism, one of her most terrible foes, is but a shadow of its former self; Atheism has taken its place.

This stability of hers in the midst of persecution, although she is herself, humanly speaking, so helpless, is a proof of her divine origin. She cannot fail.

ARTICLE II.

INFALLIBILITY.

Cannot teach error.

It follows also as a necessary consequence from all that has been said that the Church can never teach religious error. That is the meaning of infallibility. The Holy Ghost teaches her all revealed truth[1] and consequently she will ever be a truthful teacher. She is, according to St. Paul the pillar and the ground of truth[2]; therefore she must be infallible in her teaching. What she says about faith or morals must be true.

Does not enslave the mind.

But that hampers the mind, we are told, interferes with its freedom, and prevents the researches of science. Not at all, any more than the warning of a guide in the mountains interferes with my liberty, if he prevents me from falling off a precipice.

What has been the result of the free inquiry claimed by Protestants? Materialism, Pantheism, Atheism, Socialism, etc., the denial even of the

1. John xiv. 26.
2. I. Tim iii. 15.

first principles of reason. Had it followed the infallible teaching of the Church, the intellect of the world would not be in the condition in which we find it to-day.

Is not the Bible sufficient to guide men without error? No. The Bible is the word of God, but alone it is not sufficient to teach us what we have to believe, or what we have to do to save our souls. In fact we need the infallible teaching of the Church to know that the Bible is the word of God. If the Church did not tell us, we could not even know we had a Bible. St. Augustine said: "I would not believe the Gospel unless moved thereto by the authority of the Church." Without the Church it would be impossible to show that it is inspired by the Holy Ghost. It was she who preserved the Scriptures. Protestants did not discover the Bible, but it was given to them by the Catholic Church.

Bible not enough.

But is not the delight I experience in reading the Bible an assurance that it is the word of God? Not at all. A Turk might have the same delight in reading the Koran.

Delight in reading the Bible is no guide.

As to the conversion of mankind, it was not effected by reading the Bible, but by the preaching of the Church. Spreading the Scriptures among the heathens as is done by Protestant missionaries, only makes Christianity ridiculous.

The Bible did not convert the world.

We see at the present day what sad havoc is

made with the Holy Book in Protestant pulpits. Every day records some new attack upon its inspired character, some new and scandalous effort to turn it into ridicule by those who should do all in their power to show it reverence.

Protestants destroying the Bible.

The Bible is not at all clear. There are passages in it, which, as St. Peter says,[1] "the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction." There must be an infallible authority to explain it, otherwise we shall have as many erroneous creeds as we have readers. Besides, what are the ignorant and the uninstructed to do? What are those to do who cannot read? And, if each one is to judge for himself, what is the good of the Protestant ministry?

Bible not plain.

The Church had existed for many years, and given many glorious saints and martyrs to God before the New Testament existed at all.

Finally Christ did not tell His Apostles, "Go and write a Bible." He said: "Go ye into the world and preach the Gospel."

Bible did not convert the world.

But did not Christ say: "Search the Scriptures." In the first place it is not sure whether the word in the text meant "you search" or was a command bidding them "search."

Search the Scriptures.

And even if it were a command it could only have been a command to search the Old Testament, for no other then existed. We, too, may bid

1. II. Peter iii. 16.

Protestants to search the Scriptures in order to find out that Christ instituted a Church which is to guide them in the way of salvation.

ARTICLE III.

THE PRIMACY OF ST. PETER.

Having described the Church in general let us now consider in whom its authority chiefly resides. It is clear it must have one supreme authority like any other society.

Peter is first.

This authority was first conferred on St. Peter, when Christ said to him, "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."[1]

But does not St. Paul say, it is urged, "other foundation no man can lay but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus."[2] This is perfectly true. Christ is the rock, for He by His power sustains the whole building, but this does not exclude the visible foundation laid down by Christ which is Peter. In fact, St. Paul himself, while saying that there is no other foundation, calls all the Apostles "foundations whose chief corner-stone

1. Matt. xvi. 16.
2. St. Paul I. Cor. iii. 2.

is Christ."[1] Just as Christ is the true Pastor and all the others inferior or secondary pastors, so Christ is the Principal Rock, but the title may be very properly given to Peter who is the rock built upon Christ.

The giving of the keys to Peter was a way of expressing the bestowal of authority. Just as the keys of a city used to be given to one who entered into possession, or as a sceptre is handed to a king, or a crozier to a bishop.

His keys signify his power.

When Christ said "*whatsoever* thou shalt loose on earth" He put no limit to Peter's power. He made it all-embracing and supreme.

As the keys were given to Peter alone it follows that the others received their power with dependence on him. Later on He told Peter to confirm his brethren.[2]

Nor did he lose this by denying Christ; for these powers, although promised before, were conferred after the resurrection. He gave them only after Peter had repented.

His denial of Christ.

The commission to "feed the flock"[3] meant to rule. Even in profane authors the word shepherd meant the same thing as ruler.

Read the Gospels and you will find St. Peter always being put in the first place and in every-

1. John xxi. 15.
2. Eph ii. 20.
3. Luke xxii. 31.

thing. So also in all the ancient ecclesiastical writers.

Finally the whole Church always held the See of Peter to be the first of all the Sees of the Church.

Why Paul opposed him.

But what about St. Paul resisting St. Peter? Would not that suppose that Peter was not the superior? Not at all. An inferior officer might oppose his general in some war measure before action if he thought the measure unwise. The fact of St. Paul making mention of it implies Peter's superiority. There would not have been anything remarkable in opposing an inferior or an equal. St. Paul sought Peter's approval before preaching[1] and in mentioning the witnesses of the resurrection puts Peter first.[2]

ARTICLE IV.

WHO WAS PETER'S SUCCESSOR?

The Pope is Peter's successor.

When Peter died, some one must have taken his place, for the powers he received were not to die with him. Who was the successor? Clearly the one who exercised those powers immediately after Peter's death. That was the Bishop of Rome. Therefore the Bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter and has Peter's primacy in the Church.

1. I. Gal. i. 2.
2. I. Cor. xv.

But Peter never was Bishop of Rome, Protestants say, and therefore the Bishop of Rome is not his successor. To make such an assertion is to fly in the face of all history. For sixteen hundred years it was never called in question and consequently it is too late in the day to come before the world with such an unfounded objection.

Peter, Pope of Rome.

Why then, they ask, did Peter write his epistle from Babylon. Simply because he called pagan Rome Babylon on account of its wickedness. There is no historical document whatever to show that Peter ever went to Babylon in Chaldea.

Why did he write from Babylon.

From all this it is clear that the Bishop of Rome, *i. e.*, the Pope, is the successor of St. Peter, is the head of the Church, is the centre of unity with whom all must agree in faith. He is the doctor and the teacher of the whole Church.

ARTICLE V.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

Since he is all this, it follows that the Pope is infallible. That is to say, he has never erred and cannot err when, as Head of the Church, he speaks to the whole Church on matters of faith and morals. If the Church is infallible its head and mouthpiece must be.

It is very hard to make Protestants understand that when we say the Pope is infallible, we do not mean that he is impeccable; namely, that we

Pope infallible not impeccable.

imagine he cannot commit sin. We never mean and never could mean that. He certainly can commit sin. Unfortunately there have been bad Popes. We merely say that he cannot teach the Church anything false on matters which concern faith or morals. Outside of that he can make mistakes like any other mortal. Protestants and others do not like to hear that the Pope is infallible; because they always considered that they themselves are infallible in almost everything and were unwilling to grant that there was only one man who was so, and that he was so only in a very restricted sphere, and under certain peculiar and special conditions.

PART II.

THE CREED THAT IS TAUGHT.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

THE CREED.

THE SUMMARY OF OUR BELIEF.

False notions about Catholic belief.

We have seen that Christ has established a Church through which He teaches mankind and also that the Church of Christ can be none other than the one men call the Catholic Church. This fact ought to be a sufficient guarantee that its doctrines are in keeping with right reason and sound morality whereas if we really believed what Protestants sometimes say or think we believe, we ought to be considered either devoid of sense or extremely wicked. Let us state, therefore, what we do believe. We have a compendium or brief statement of our faith, in what is called the Apostles' Creed. It comes to us from the time of the Apostles. We shall state and explain its principal parts.

CHAPTER I.

GOD.

All can know God.

The knowledge of the existence of God is so clear that no one who has intelligence can be excusably ignorant of it. For, as Holy Scripture says: "The invisible things are clearly seen and understood by the things that are made; His eternal power also, and divinity: so that they are inexcusable."[1]

Hence the Church has declared that if any one assert that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be known with certainty from created things by the natural light of human reason, let him be anathema.[2]

All nations believe in God.

The existence of God has been believed by all nations. No savage tribe has been found without some religious rite and some notion, though at times frightfully distorted, about the divinity. They admitted also a natural law, which implies a lawgiver, namely God.

Nations do not come from the savage state.

This conviction does not arise from fear as some modern atheists assert. But they first knew God and from that knowledge fear naturally arose. Knowledge came first, fear afterwards. For mankind was not first in the savage

1. Rom. i. 20.
2. Vat. Council DeFide II. Can. 1.

state developing into civilization later, as unbelievers assert; but, on the contrary, it degenerated through vice into barbarism and savagery, keeping, however, even in that fallen condition, remnants of the primary revelation made to the progenitors of the race. Hence the remarkable traditions we find among them about God and the after life. Besides, human reason itself, apart from this, is able to discover the existence of God.

Proof from reason.

Who made all this world around me? it asks. Some mighty being, perhaps. And who made that mighty being? Was it some one else? And so it will go on if it chooses till it finds one who was made by none, who always existed, who is the cause of all things and the effect of none. That Being is God.

World not made by chance.

The admirable order around us supposes an intelligent being who brought it into existence. It is absurd to ascribe it to chance. The commonest little bit of mechanism is not made by chance. How then assert that this vast universe is the result of it? We need not seriously consider the question any further.

The nature of God.

This Being, the Creator of heaven and earth, is unchangeable, eternal, has neither past nor future, is infinite, knows all things, is the source of all truth and perfection, etc.

When we speak of His intelligence, His will, His justice, His goodness, His mercy, we are

The mind can know God, but not completely.

merely helping out our limited understanding by different aspects of His infinite perfection. It is absolutely impossible for our mind to grasp it all in one concept or thought. We are compelled to use those expressions because we behold different effects produced by God's act; effects of mercy, effects of goodness, effects of justice, etc., and so we speak of God's mercy, goodness, justice, etc., as if they were different things in God, whereas they are not.

Only one God.

There can be only one God. Because as God is infinitely perfect, it would be absurd to imagine another. If there were another, the first would not be infinite. Plain as this is, however, the greater part of mankind had fallen into the belief that there were many gods, and it was in order to keep alive the knowledge of the one true God that the Jewish people were kept apart from all the other nations of the world.

CHAPTER II.

THERE ARE THREE PERSONS IN ONE GOD.

The Triune God.

Nevertheless, although there is but one God, there are three divine persons in God—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. These three persons, though distinct from each other, are, nevertheless, one and the same God. They have each the self-same perfection, the same power, the same eternal existence, etc.

How this is so we cannot understand, but that it *is* so, we must admit, because it is the teaching of the Church, which has been commissioned to speak for Jesus Christ, who cannot deceive us. There the matter must rest.

The Son is begotten of the Father from all eternity. "Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee."[1] The word "this day," comprehends past, present and future, and signifies eternity. What this eternal generation of the Son is, goes beyond our power of mind to grasp. We merely know that it is so, because we are told it by an infallible authority.

The Holy Ghost is not begotten but proceeds from the Father and the Son from all eternity. This procession, as it is called, of the Holy Ghost

1. Ps. ii. 7.

from the Father and the Son, is another of the inscrutable mysteries of the Holy Trinity which we must accept without endeavoring to understand.

The Greek schism.

The denial of the procession of the Holy Ghost from both the Father and the Son was the reason why a portion of the Greek Church separated from the True Church, and constitute to-day what is called the Greek Schism. Their error was based on a false interpretation of the Holy Scripture.

The Trinity beyond but not against reason.

It must be borne in mind, however, that although this mystery of the Trinity is above our understanding it is not in opposition to it. It involves no contradiction. For we have not to believe that the divine nature is one and three at the same time; but unity is asserted of the divine nature, and trinity of the divine persons.

Vaguely revealed in the Old Testament.

This mystery was only implicitly revealed in the Old Testament. In the New Testament it is clearly told; and Christ commanded His Apostles to go and baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But even now that it is revealed it is impossible to give any cogent proof from reason alone to demonstrate it. We believe it, because God has revealed it.

CHAPTER III.

GOD IS THE CREATOR.

What is creation.

What does creation mean? It means making something out of nothing. Now we hold the world was made out of nothing. Not that this nothing was a sort of material from which God produced the world. That would be nonsense. But we mean that He called into being what before had no previous existence, or no matter from which it was produced. That requires infinite power. A finite being can produce something which did not previously exist, provided he has some material to make it from. Not so God. He spoke and the world was. Only God can do that.

ARTICLE I.

THE VISIBLE WORLD.

Age of the world.

How much time has elapsed since the creation of the world is not certain. Whether the six days in which God is said to have created the world mean six days of twenty-four hours each, or six great epochs, we leave to the learned to determine.

Purpose of the world.

Why the world was created is easier to know. He wished to communicate His goodness to

creatures. Creatures, on the other hand, can have no other purpose than to show forth the glory of God. "The heavens are telling the glory of God," says the Scripture. That is done even by the material universe. The creatures that have understanding do it chiefly by rising from the knowledge of created perfections to the knowledge of the infinite perfection of God, and by this praise and adoration of Him securing their own eternal happiness.

ARTICLE II.

THE ANGELS.

Fall of the angels.

Besides the visible world God created innumerable angelic beings, divided into what are called hierarchies or choirs. They are pure spirits, far superior in power and intelligence to man. To obtain their final happiness they had to undergo a trial. Many unhappily refused to submit to the will of their Creator, and were instantly cast into hell which that moment was created to receive them. "God," says St. Peter, "spared not the angels who sinned, but delivered them, drawn by infernal ropes, into the lower hell."[1]

These fallen angels were not deprived of their natural powers which are very great, but God restrains them from employing those powers for

1. II. Pet. ii. 4.

harm beyond certain limits, and permits them, only in so far as they may be a trial for the just or a punishment for the wicked. The angels who were faithful in the trial were immediately admitted to the enjoyment of the beatific vision of God.

ARTICLE III.

MAN.

Creation of man.

The most perfect creature in the visible world is man. He is composed of body and soul. Holy Writ tells us that God formed the body of man from the slime of the earth and breathed on his face the breath of life.[1] A great difference is made in the Scripture between the production of the animals and that of man. As to the animals He said "let the waters, let the earth bring them forth." The body of man, on the contrary, was formed by God Himself, and the soul which animates the body is formed by the breath of God; viz., He created it a spirit endowed with reason and free will, and as the Scriptures assure us, made it after His own image and likeness.

His soul a spirit.

That man's soul is a *spirit* is evident from the fact that he understands things which are quite independent of matter. He can understand truth, justice, right, duty, of which no sensible image can possibly be made. Animals have knowledge,

1. Gen ii. 7.

but they can go no further than sense-perception; they can never have any abstract ideas of truth, justice, etc., as man can. This is in accordance with Holy Writ which tells us that animals have no understanding.[1] They have only instinct; they never improve or perfect themselves. As they were a thousand years ago they are to-day.

Free.

Man is also *free*. We are conscious that we have duties to perform, and our conscience upbraids us when we neglect them. That could not occur if we were not free. Nor could we be punished for not performing them.

Immortal.

The soul is *immortal*. For why should it perish with the body? The body dies or goes to pieces because it is made up of parts, but the soul is a spiritual being and has no parts. Therefore it cannot die unless God would annihilate it. But no possible reason can be assigned why God should annihilate it. Short of that then (which will never happen) the soul must live forever.

Again, does not the soul's thirst for perfect happiness prove its immortality? A longing that is to be forever frustrated was something that even the pagans put as one of the punishments of hell. We cannot imagine that a beneficent Creator would treat every human being in that way. Now happiness can never be perfect if we know it will stop some time. Besides, if there is

1. Job vi. 17.

no life after this, how can God's justice ever be satisfied? It is a frequent occurrence for crime to go unavenged in this life. There must be a settlement afterwards.

Reason teaches all that; besides it is of faith that another life follows this one. "The wicked go into everlasting judgment, but the just unto life everlasting."[1]

Raised above his natural condition.

Still more than all this was given to man: he was raised to a *supernatural* state. He was enriched with sanctifying grace, and made the adopted child of God, with a destiny for everlasting bliss in the beatific vision of God. He had many other privileges besides, for example, full control over his lower or animal faculties, exemption from bodily sufferings, freedom from the sting of concupiscence, the power of not dying, etc., all of which he was to transmit to his posterity. None of this was due or owed to man. By nature he had no right to any of them. They all belonged to a sphere above his natural state, one namely, which would be pretty nearly the condition we are in at present, *i. e.*, a state subject to sickness and death; with this difference, however, that sin would not have superadded its corruption and effects.

Adam's sin.

Nevertheless although the first man had been raised to that supernatural state he sinned.

1. Matt. xxv. 46.

What was the consequence? He lost the gift of sanctifying grace along with all the other gifts that went with it. As he rebelled against God, his animal faculties rebelled against his reason; because his concupiscence inclined him to evil, the practice of virtue became difficult and bodily infirmities, miseries, and death supervened. Not only did he himself lose these gifts, but, as head of the human race he entailed the loss of them upon all his descendants. We are made sharers in the sin and punishment of our first parents. We are thus conceived in what is called original sin. "I was conceived in iniquity and in sin my mother conceived me."[1] "Death passed upon all by one man in whom all have sinned," says St. Paul.[2]

Our sin in Adam.

Original sin, therefore, is a stain which is upon our soul the first instant the soul is joined to the body. It is a privation of the sanctifying grace which would have been given us. Its effect is to take away from us our right to inherit the heavenly kingdom, and to make us children of wrath and slaves of the devil.

Pelagius, one of the early heretics, denied the existence of original sin altogether, while the first Protestants going to the other extreme of error, admitted it, indeed, but declared that it

1. Ps. l.
2. Rom. v. 12-10.

resulted in the total depravity of the human race. While in that state man was incapable of any good act whatsoever, even in the natural order, and that it deprived him even of his free will. That was their error.

CHAPTER IV.

GOD BECAME MAN.

Need of a Saviour.

When man broke away from God there was no getting back again. Do what he might to atone for his sin, God was not bound to accept it as a satisfaction. Besides, his natural acts could never reach above his natural condition, and, therefore, he could never attain the supernatural end for which he had been destined and which he had lost. The whole human race would, therefore, have been lost had not God in His mercy sent a Redeemer.

ARTICLE I.

WHO IS CHRIST?

This Redeemer was the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. To satisfy divine justice for the sins of mankind He was to suffer and die. "God so loved the world as to give His Only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish but have life everlasting."[1]

Redeemer foretold.

He was promised immediately after the fall of our first parents.[2] This promise was renewed to Abraham.[3] Jacob foretold the tribe from which

1. John iii. 16.
2. Gen. iii. 5.
3. Gen. xii. 13.

He was to issue and the time of His coming.[1] Other prophets described the various circumstances of His life and death: Isaias, that He was to be born of a virgin; Micheas named the city of Bethlehem; Daniel gave the year of His coming; David, in one of the Psalms, the details of His Passion with such exactness that it reads more like a history than a prophetic utterance.

All prophecies verified in Jesus.

Now all of these prophecies have been verified in Jesus Christ. Who, therefore, is the Redeemer of mankind? Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary, of whom Catholics must believe that He is true God and true Man.

I.—CHRIST IS GOD.

Christ's divinity.

First, He is true God. How can we prove that? By opening the Holy Scripture and seeing what it says of Him. In the fifth chapter of St. John, verse 19, for instance, we read that He does all that the Father does. Therefore He is God. In verse 21 He gives life everlasting to those who believe in Him. Therefore, He is God. In verse 22 He is Supreme Judge. Therefore He is God. In verse 23 He claims the same honor as the Father. Therefore, He is God, and so on—all in that single chapter. Other passages might be adduced, for Holy Scripture abounds in similar proofs, but surely these will suffice.

1. Gen. xlix. 10

II.—CHRIST IS MAN.

Christ is truly man. He is truly man because He was born, suffered and died. He could not have done so if He had not our human nature.

Two natures in one person.

It must be borne in mind, however, that though He had our human nature He was not a human person. He was a divine person with a divine nature and a human nature. Thus as a divine person He could say "The Father and I are one,"[1] but on account of His human nature He could say, "The Father is greater than I."[2]

Although He had a human nature, nevertheless all His actions, even in that nature, were of infinite value; because all of those actions were the actions of a divine person.

Errors and Heresies.

The errors which arose against this doctrine of Catholic belief were first that of the early heretics who said that He only appeared to have a body. They were the Docetæ. Then came Nestorius, who said there were two Persons in Christ, a Divine and a Human Person. After him came Eutyches, who said that there was but one Person in Christ but that the human nature was absorbed in the divine nature. Then the Monothelites taught that He had no human will but only a divine will. Most widespread of all was the Arian heresy, which regarded Christ only as a

1. John, x. 30.
2. John xiv. 28.

man. It is pretty much as the Protestant mind rates Him to-day. All of these heresies were condemned in successive councils of the Church, all of which reiterated the Catholic doctrine that Christ is the only Son of God, the second Person of the blessed Trinity, true God and true man—a Divine Person, with two natures, one human the other divine.

ARTICLE II.

WHO IS CHRIST'S MOTHER?

I.—SHE IS THE MOTHER OF GOD.

Mary's right to her title of Mother of God.

Since Jesus Christ is God, it follows that His Mother is the Mother of God. Not that she produced His divinity, that would be absurd, but as she is the mother of that humanity which is the humanity of a Divine Person she is rightly called the Mother of that Person, the Mother of God. As we rightly and truly say that God suffered and died for us, though He did so only in His human nature, so we rightly say that Mary is the Mother of God, although she is so only according to His human nature.

II.—SHE IS A VIRGIN.

Christ her only Son.

Catholics must likewise believe that although she was a mother she was also a Virgin; a virgin before and after and during the birth of Christ.

Brothers of Christ.

The assertions made by Protestant writers that after the birth of Christ she had other children, are too shocking to consider. If there is mention in the Bible of the brothers and sisters of our Lord, it is simply because then, as now, in Oriental countries, those titles are given to cousins as well as to those who are, strictly speaking, brothers and sisters. Thus also the 'friends' of a bridegroom are called his children.[1]

III.—SHE WAS CONCEIVED WITHOUT ORIGINAL SIN.

Her Immaculate Conception.

We are also taught that the Mother of Christ was conceived and born into this world without Original Sin. That is what we believe by the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. This means that at the first moment of her existence in the womb of her mother she was clothed with sanctifying grace. This privilege was accorded her because she was to be the mother of the Redeemer of mankind.

She was redeemed by Christ.

Then she was not redeemed by Christ, it is argued, because she never was in sin. On the contrary, she reaped more benefit from the redemption than any one else. Her redemption did not consist in being freed from the slavery of sin but in being prevented from falling into it.

1. Matt. ix. 15.

This doctrine was always held by the Church, though only explicitly defined in 1854, just as the Church always believed in the divinity of Christ though it was defined only in the Council of Nice. It is not clearly mentioned in Holy Scripture but is implied in the words of God declaring the perpetual enmity which was to exist between her and the serpent: "I shall put enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed and her seed. She shall crush thy head."[1]

Not a new doctrine.

ARTICLE III.

WHY CHRIST SUFFERED.

Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ assumed a body capable of feeling pain because He wished to redeem us by suffering and dying. A prayer would have sufficed, because all the actions of the humanity being those of a Divine Person were of infinite merit. But this was not sufficient for His love. Besides giving an adequate atonement for our sins, He wished to show us by His example the road to salvation, which is no other than the road of the cross. By an excess of love for us He wished to win our love for Him.

Love of Christ for us.

By His sufferings and death He reconciled us with the Father, restored us to our heavenly in-

1. Gen. iii. 15.

heritance and merited for us the graces necessary to attain our final end.

He died for all.

He died for all[1], not only for the elect, as Calvin and Jansenius impiously asserted. He died for all, as well for those who preceded as those who came after His death on the Cross. If all are not saved it is not because they have not the means of salvation but because they have not availed themselves of those means. The Bible says that "God wishes all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of truth."[2]

Limbo.

When, at the death of Christ, the soul was separated from the body, the divinity remained united to both so that both were adorable. While the body remained in the sepulchre the soul descended into hell as the Creed puts it. This hell was not the abode of the damned, but the place where the souls of the just had to remain until heaven was opened for them by the death of the Saviour.

ARTICLE IV.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

Christ rose from the dead.

Our Lord's resurrection is the strongest proof of His being what he declared Himself to be. "If Christ is not risen," says St. Paul, "our faith is vain and we are still in our sins,"[3]

1. I. Tim. ii. 6.
2. I. Tim. ii. 4.
3. I. Cor. xv. 17.

Christ's resurrection is also a pledge of our own resurrection from the dead.

The reality of Christ's resurrection is substantiated by the most solid proofs that any historical fact can possess.

No possible doubt of His resurrection.

In the first place Christ foretold His resurrection. It was known and feared by his enemies. See St. Matt., Chapters xii. and xxvii., on these two points. On that account they took every possible means to prevent it, and, if possible, to give the lie to His prediction and so discredit His teaching. That He rose as He foretold is a fact beyond all possible doubt. On the morning of the third day His body had disappeared from the tomb, though guarded by a band of soldiers.

Objections of unbelievers.

"But," it is said, "His body was stolen while the soldiers slept." Both were impossible. That they should have slept and not be put to death for it, and that the timid Apostles could have taken it while they were awake, either suggestion is childish.

Modern disbelievers say that He had only swooned on the cross and had revived in the sepulchre. It is hard to imagine how He could revive, whose Heart was pierced with a spear and who was then embalmed, or how, if He had revived He could have removed the great stone with which the tomb was closed. This is in keeping with the other objections.

Apostles neither deceived nor deceiving.

The account of the Apostles on the other hand is absolutely trustworthy. They were not deceived themselves, nor could they deceive others, even if they wished. They were not deceived themselves, because Christ was seen not by one person alone, or by a few, or a few times, but again and again, now to some and now to all the Apostles at the same time. They ate with Him, conversed with Him, touched Him, put their hands in His wounds, saw Him work miracles and at last He was seen by five hundred people at once. They were not credulous, they were the reverse, and the only consequence of their telling what they saw was to lose their lives for it. They were all put to death precisely because they were witnesses to His resurrection. To suppose hallucination in themselves, or a desire to deceive others in such circumstances is absurd.

CHAPTER V.

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

We and the Saints in heaven.

This article of our faith does not merely signify that all Catholics are bound together in charity and love, but that there is a link between the living and the dead. The saints in heaven take the most lively interest in the welfare of the Church on earth and the salvation of souls, and the members of the Church on earth are bound to honor and love the glorious ones in heaven who are interceding for them before the throne of God. Surely if as St. James says "the prayer of the just on earth availeth much"[1] the prayers of the saints in heaven are much more efficacious to obtain the graces we stand in need of.

Honor to them not against Christ.

But, Protestants object, this is against the honor due to Christ, who alone is our mediator with God. Not at all. For if people can pray for us on earth without interfering with the mediatorship of Christ, no more will the prayers of the saints in heaven affect that mediatorship. We have, moreover, the warrant of Holy Writ that the saints offer our prayers to God.[2] The angels we are told rejoice over one sinner doing penance. The Bible is full of texts which teach

1. Jas. v. 16.
2. Apoc. viii. 4.

us this beautiful doctrine of the communion of saints. But is it not better to go directly to Christ? Not if we can get any one better than ourselves to go along with us. If I have offended my father I would like to have my mother speak to him for me.

The honor we pay to the saints does not detract from the honor we pay to God. On the contrary, it helps us to honor Him more. We honor them precisely because He honors them. We cannot, therefore, be wrong.

Not idolatry.

That honor is not idolatry. We never regard any of them, even the Blessed Virgin, as any more than mortal creatures. There is one God and Him alone we adore.

The respect we pay to their images and relics is the same respect we pay to the images and relics of all great men and women. Every great city is full of the statues of its heroes. The Church does the same with her heroes and heroines. We certainly do not adore the statues of Washington, even if we deck them with flowers, have processions around them, inaugurate pageants for their unveiling, etc. So it is for the ceremonies of the Church in honor of her saints.

Worship of images.

But God forbade the Jews to make unto themselves graven things. No, he did not. He forbade them to make them to "*adore*" them. As usual Protestants in this case read only half the text.

There were statues of the Cherubim in the Temple itself in accordance with the positive command of God. Moses made a statue of the brazen serpent which, it must be remarked, healed those who looked up to it.

The Blessed Virgin the greatest of all Saints.

We honor the Blessed Virgin in a special manner because she is especially holy. She is greater than all the other saints, but being a creature is infinitely inferior to God. Protestants do not understand the prerogatives of the Blessed Virgin because they know so little about Jesus Christ.

Our link with the dead.

The Communion of Saints implies another beautiful relation between those who are on earth and those who are dead but have not reached the happiness of heaven, viz., the souls in purgatory. The souls in purgatory cannot merit any more and cannot shorten the time of their punishment or diminish its intensity. This doctrine of the Communion of Saints affords the consoling knowledge that we can help them by our prayers, our good works and chiefly by the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

CHAPTER VI.

PURGATORY.

Punishment of forgiven sin.

This brings us to that other doctrine of the Church, viz., the existence of purgatory. We must remember that even when our sins are forgiven we have to atone for them. Thus we see the terrible punishment David underwent after his sin of adultery was forgiven.[1] If we die without having atoned fully for our sins on this earth, we have to atone for them in the next. The place in which we atone for them is called purgatory. That we must atone for them is clear, because nothing defiled can enter heaven,[2] and we are told by St. Paul that it is by fire[3] that this atonement or purification takes place. Purgatory merely means the place of purification. Our Lord warns us that we cannot leave it until the last farthing of our debt is paid.[4]

Purgatory proved by common sense.

Does not reason show us the existence of purgatory plainly enough when we put it this way? A person who dies without sin, goes to heaven; one who dies with grievous sins unrepented of, goes to hell; one who has neither one nor the other, *i. e.*, no grievous sins, and yet some small

1. II. Kings xii.
2. Apoc. xxi. 27.
3. I. Cor. iii. 13.
4. Matt. v. 26.

ones, must go to some middle place. That middle place, where his small sins will be purged off, Catholics call purgatory.

In fact, the Protestant conception of hell is little else than the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, viz., a place where sinners are punished for a while. They admit purgatory without knowing it.

What a beautiful doctrine purgatory is if we look at it in the Catholic light! It is necessary for God's justice, but it affords us an exercise of the most tender mercy, for it enables us to help our friends who have gone before us. It makes earth better, besides, for the holier we are the more the suffering souls are assisted.

The Jewish Custom.

The practice of praying for the dead dates from the beginning of the Church. It was the custom of the Jews, also, as we see in the Second Book of Machabees, where Judas is spoken of as gathering a large sum of money, and sending it to Jerusalem, that prayers might be offered for his soldiers, who had fallen in battle. This custom of praying for their dead still prevails among them.

CHAPTER VII.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

The Catholic doctrine is that not only shall the soul live forever, but the body also. The bodies of the dead will rise again and be united to their souls, the just for an immortality of happiness, the reprobate for an immortality of pain and woe.

Our own resurrection.

This truth must have been revealed in the beginning of the human race. For we see Job declaring his belief in it.[1] The Sadducees who were heretics among the Jews were rebuked by Our Lord for not believing it.[2]

It is not impossible.

"But how," say the disbelievers of the present day, "can God take what is mingled with the dust of the earth and give to each one His own body?"

To that we answer that the same power that created those bodies out of nothing can gather them wherever and however they may be scattered.

Consequently Catholics must admit the doctrines that there is heaven for those who are saved and hell for those who are damned—both eternal.

1. Job xix. 25.
2. Matt. xxii. 31.

CHAPTER VIII.

HEAVEN AND HELL.

About heaven there is not much difficulty. Almost all admit it, except those who deny that there is a future life at all, since, according to them, man has no soul, or if he has, it is not immortal. That is not only against revelation but is against reason, as has already been shown when we spoke about the creation of man.

Possibly the reason they do not admit heaven or eternal life for the good is because they do not want to admit hell for the wicked.

Eternity of hell.

Catholics must admit the eternity of hell or they are not Catholics. We have the explicit and unmistakable declaration of the existence of the eternal fire of hell from the lips of our Blessed Saviour Himself when describing the last judgment. He tells us the very words which He Himself will utter on that dreadful day over those who refuse to obey Him: "Depart from Me accursed into everlasting fire."[1] That is surely proof enough.

Hell not unjust or unmerciful.

But why should God punish with everlasting punishment an act which lasted only a moment? Why not? Murder is the act of a moment but the criminal is punished with death or perpetual

1. Matt. xxv. 41.

imprisonment, which is everlasting separation from the society he has attacked.

But does not the goodness of God require that some time or other all should be pardoned and made partakers of eternal life? This is the doctirne of the Universalists.

No repentance after death.

To this we answer that we cannot indeed prove by mere reason that after this life some chance might not be given to repent and be saved. We know from revelation, however, that this will not take place. Reason can, nevertheless, show us this, viz., that the time of probation ought to have some fixed term; as far as we know that term is death. If that term is reached and man refuses to repent there can no longer be any hope of pardon. As he has an immortal soul and is destined to live forever, his separation from God and the consequent sufferings must endure forever.

How fire burns without consuming.

How is it that the damned are to live forever in fire and not be consumed, we cannot explain. That it is so, we know, for Christ has revealed it and His Church teaches it. We know also that if one is cast into hell, it is through his own fault and is not to be ascribed to God. "Thy perdition is thine own O Israel." [1]

1. Osee xiii. 9.

PART III.

THE SACRAMENTS THAT SANCTIFY.

CHAPTER I.

THE SACRAMENTS IN GENERAL.

By His sufferings and death Christ atoned for our sins and merited for us the graces necessary for our salvation. But these merits have to be applied to individual souls. For as a medicine, however efficacious, is useless until applied, so the Passion of our Lord though superabundant and more than sufficient to save, is profitless for those who refuse to avail themselves of its life-giving powers.

Sacraments apply Christ's blood.

The graces which He merited for us are sanctifying grace and what we call actual graces.

Sanctifying Grace is a supernatural gift inherent in the soul which makes it a child of God, a temple of the Holy Ghost and imparts to it the habits of faith, hope and charity.

Sanctifying grace.

Actual Grace is a supernatural gift, but not a permanent thing as sanctifying grace is. It illumines the mind and strengthens the will and enables it to perform *acts* of faith, hope, and charity, whereas sanctifying grace imparts *habits* and helps it to practise all Christian virtues and overcome the temptations that arise.

Actual grace.

Without grace nothing profitable for salvation can be done [1] "Without Me you can do nothing"

1. I. Cor. iii. 5. Phil. ii. 13.

Alone we can do nothing for heaven.

says the Lord.[1] Not even the beginning of faith, the first aspiration towards God can be made without the assistance of grace. This was taught us by the Church when she condemned the sect of Semipelagians.

All can be saved.

But God sincerely wishes the salvation of all and, therefore, does not refuse the necessary means to come to the knowledge of truth. However man may, because of his free will refuse them, but the blame is not to be attached to God's action.

The principal means of obtaining grace are the Sacraments.

A SACRAMENT may be defined as an outward sign instituted by Christ for conferring grace.

God alone can institute the sacraments because He alone can connect grace with outward signs. Every sacrament consists of two elements, namely, *matter* and *form*.

Elements of a Sacrament.

The outward sign or act which constitutes the matter may of itself signify various things. It must therefore be determined by some words to signify something special. Hence the sacramental words constitute the form.

Thus in baptism, water is the remote matter, the pouring it on the forehead is the proximate matter. This pouring of the water or washing becomes baptism by the words: "I baptize thee

1. Jno. xv. 5.

in the name, etc." Thus the words determine the outward act of washing or ablution to signify the inward grace conferred by baptism.

Effects.

Sacraments confer a twofold grace: 1. Sanctifying grace or its increase; and 2. Special grace, or the peculiar help for which the sacrament was instituted.

The sacraments not only *signify* the grace received, but by an efficacy of their own *they really confer* it.

What resemble Sacraments.

Certain devotional acts, such as making the sign of the cross, using holy water, kissing the crucifix, etc., may be used as means to obtain grace, but their efficacy depends on the disposition and devotion of those who use them. From their resemblance to the sacraments, they are called *sacramentals*. But that is not the way the sacraments produce their effect.

Certain dispositions are indeed required for the worthy reception of the sacraments but they are mere conditions. Even if those dispositions are not there the sacrament would be really conferred, although the want of these dispositions would be an impediment to the efficacy of the sacrament.

Minister.

He who administers a sacrament must be empowered to do so; and must employ the rite prescribed. However, it is not necessary that he should possess holiness. Not even faith is required,

provided he has the intention of doing what the Church does. The reason is that he does not confer the sacrament by his own power, but by the power of Christ, whose instrument he is.

Kinds of Sacraments.

Some of the sacraments are called sacraments of the (spiritually) living; others sacraments of the (spiritually) dead. The former suppose that the soul has spiritual life, that is to say, is in a state of grace; the latter that the soul is in a state of sin which it changes to that of grace or life. These are baptism and penance; all the others are sacraments of the living.

The seal.

Some sacraments, viz., Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Orders, imprint on the soul a permanent and indelible character, or seal as St. Augustine calls it. This seal remains in the soul, even after death, for the glory of the just, and the shame and confusion of the reprobate. These three sacraments can be received but once.

Protestants abolished the Sacraments.

Christ instituted seven sacraments, viz., Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, Holy Eucharist, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders and Matrimony. Protestants admit, at most, two, and even these they divest of all, or nearly all efficacy. They are Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In fact, as the fundamental doctrine of Luther, Calvin, and the English reformers, was that faith alone which was little else than a 'leaning on the Lord,' was enough; that a 'hope in Him,' or 'on Him,' as

they say, was sufficient for justification; sacraments became, by the very fact, altogether superfluous.

Man's whole life protected.

By instituting these seven sacraments, our Lord provided the means of sanctification for every stage of life. Thus, when the child is born, he is regenerated in baptism; when he reaches the use of reason, confirmation makes him a fearless soldier of Christ. As he needs food for the spiritual life, the Holy Eucharist is prepared for him. When he is weakened or wounded by sin, penance restores him to life and health; and when he reaches the end of his mortal career, Extreme Unction arms him for the last combat. The power of administering these sacraments is perpetuated by Holy Orders, and matrimony sanctifies the union of husband and wife for the propagation and education of children.

Always seven in the Church.

That the Church always professed its belief in the seven sacraments, is evident from the fact that all of the earlier sects which separated themselves from the Church, except the Manicheans, still cling to that number. The Nestorians who left the Church fifteen hundred years ago, yet hold that belief—a fact which establishes beyond a doubt what was the tenet of the Christian world upon this point.

CHAPTER II.

BAPTISM.

Christ's command.

That Christ instituted the sacrament of baptism is clear from His command to the Apostles to "go and baptize all the nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."[1]

Ways of baptizing.

The remote matter of baptism is natural water, the proximate matter, the ablution or washing with the water. This ablution is performed by immersion or dipping, by aspersion or sprinkling, by infusion or pouring. The last one is the custom adopted in the Latin Church, and is done by a triple pouring on the head or forehead.

Common water.

Any natural water will answer the requirement for a valid or genuine baptism, but the Church uses water specially blessed for the purpose.

Words.

The form of baptism is: I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and the water must be poured as the words are being pronounced.

Ceremonies.

The Church has added several ceremonies to the rite of baptism to give it solemnity and to symbolize the effects produced on the soul by the sacrament.

1. Matt. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15.

Effects in children.

The effect of this sacrament is a regeneration or rebirth of the soul. It cleanses the soul from the stain of original sin, clothes it with sanctifying grace and transforms it from the child of wrath that it was, to a child of God with a right to a heavenly kingdom. The habits of faith, hope, and charity, are infused into the soul and an ineffaceable mark or seal is impressed upon it.

In adults.

When adults are baptized they receive over and above all this, the pardon of all the sins they have ever committed, provided they sincerely repent of them, as well as the remission of all the punishment that those sins would have entailed. So that, if such a person died immediately after baptism, he would be carried to heaven immediately without going through the purifying flames of purgatory. In the supposition that such a person had not repented of his past sins, he would be validly baptized indeed, but the other effects would be suspended till the obstacle was removed by a sincere repentance and the sacrament of penance. An adult, baptized against his will, does not receive baptism.

Remnants of original sin.

Although baptism effaces original sin, it does not extinguish the fire of concupiscence, nor exempt us from suffering and death. Concupiscence, if resisted, is a source of merit, makes us watchful, and fosters humility. The miseries of this life help us to conform ourselves to our

divine Saviour by suffering with patience and resignation.

Baptism indispensable

Baptism is necessary for salvation, not only for adults, but also for infants. The declaration of the Lord admits of no exception. "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven."[1] The Church always insisted upon infant baptism, for original as well as actual sin excludes one from heaven. Unbaptized children do not suffer the pains of the lost, but they never reach the heaven of the blessed. The tremendous responsibility of parents with regard to the baptism of their children is evident enough from this.

Substitutes.

Sacramental baptism may be partially supplied by the baptism of blood, or martyrdom, and by the baptism of desire. The first consists in undergoing death for Christ when it is inflicted in hatred of the Christian faith. "He that shall lose his life for Me," says Christ, "will find it."[2] The Church honors as martyrs the little children of Bethlehem who were put to death by Herod, out of hatred for Christ. Adults, however, to be truly martyrs, must suffer death willingly. He who resists, cannot claim the martyr's crown. Baptism of desire consists in an act of perfect contrition and love of God, coupled with the desire of receiving baptism, from which he finds

1. John iii. 5.
2. Matt. x. 39.

himself debarred. The act of desire may be explicit, if the necessity of baptism is known. It may be implicit if he is unaware of its necessity. For he really, in the case supposed, loves God, and desires to do His will.

The baptism of desire, however, would not make him a member of the visible Church of Christ, nor entitle him to receive the other sacraments.

Any one can baptize.

The ordinary minister of baptism is the bishop and the priest. The deacon is the extraordinary minister, but in case of necessity, any person, whether Christian or not, may administer the sacrament, provided he use the right matter and form, and has the intention of doing what the Church does.

The Church condemned those who taught that heretics, baptized by heretical ministers, should be rebaptized when converted to the true faith, although it was a saint who was most prominent in holding that bad doctrine. At present, converts, as a general rule, receive conditional baptism, because it is impossible to be sure that the right matter or form had been used, or that the one who baptized had the intention of conferring Christian baptism. But if it were ascertained that a baptism, administered by a Protestant minister was properly performed, it would be a sacrilege to rebaptize.

CHAPTER III.

CONFIRMATION.

Object of confirming.

Confirmation is a sacrament by which a baptized person receives strength to profess his faith openly and to conform his life to its teachings. To receive the effects of this sacrament one must be in a state of grace. It is administered by the bishop, but, by special delegation from the Pope, a priest may confer it. Chrism, however, which has been consecrated by a bishop must be employed. In the Greek Church confirmation is received immediately after baptism.

Chrism and words.

What is called the matter of the sacrament is the imposition of hands and the anointing with chrism. The form is: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation." As confirmation imprints a character on the soul it can be received but once.

In use from the beginning.

That confirmation is a sacrament which has been in use since the beginning of the Church is evident from the fact that the Eastern heretics to this day hold it as having been instituted by Christ to confer grace. In the Acts of the Apostles we see that SS. Peter and John went down to Samaria to confirm those whom St. Philip, the deacon, had converted and baptized, that they might receive the Holy Ghost.[1]

1. Acts viii, 17.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

As a sacrament, penance is the rite in which the priest, as the representative of God, forgives the sins committed after baptism of those who are truly penitent, who sincerely confess and are ready to atone for them.

The remote matter are the sins, the proximate matter are the acts of the penitent, viz., contrition, confession and satisfaction.

The form are the words pronounced by the priest: "I absolve thee from thy sins."

Priests can forgive sins.

Christ gave His Apostles the power of forgiving sins. After His resurrection He said to them: "As the Father has sent Me, I also send you." When He had said this He breathed on them saying: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven; whose sins you shall retain they are retained."[1] At another time He said to them: "Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."[2]

All sins can be forgiven.

This latter power is much more ample than the former. Besides the right to legislate, which this text implies, it also gives the power to for-

1. John xx. 21-23.
2. Matt. xviii. 18.

give sins which are the fetters that require loosening before one can enter heaven. Remark the word: "whatsoever." No exception is made. Hence all sins can be forgiven, not merely original sin as the first Protestants pretended, but all others committed after baptism.

Till the end of the world.

This power was not granted to the Apostles as a personal gift but for the good of the Church. It was to rest with the Church till the end of the world. It is necessary as long as there is sin, and unfortunately there will be sin to the end of the world. Hence, when given to the Apostles, it was intended to be transmitted to their successors in the sacred ministry as long as the Church would endure. The Church has always exercised this power and the only objections we hear against it in the first ages, come from the heretical Montanists and Novatians who, while admitting the Church's right to forgive, excepted the sins of apostacy, adultery and fornication. Their doctrine, of course, was condemned as false.

Only priests can forgive.

The right to forgive belongs only to the bishops and priests, for they only are the successors of the Apostles.

There must be confession.

As the right is not only to forgive but to retain the sins of the penitent, the priest is evidently constituted a judge who is to determine whether the absolution sought for is deserved or not. Hence he must know the disposition of the peni-

tent, hence the penitent must confess his sins. Confession of sin is, therefore, obligatory on all who desire to be absolved.

Auricular confession, that is, confession into the ear of the priest, was always enjoined by the Church upon every one. It was certainly in use at the time of the Nestorian heresy; for the Nestorians in spite of their heresy have kept up the practice ever since.

Always practiced.

It must be a divine institution. Otherwise it could never have been introduced into the Church. No one could be induced to submit to such a disagreeable obligation unless he were convinced that those who impose it have a right to do so. If it had been introduced later than the apostolic times its very novelty would have caused its rejection. But though we have the records of every innovation attempted by the various heretical sects, at different epochs of the Church's history, there is no record of any movement to introduce confession. It must have been imposed by Christ, otherwise popes and bishops, and priests and laity would never have submitted to it.

Its difficulty proves that God imposed it.

The order of one of the Councils insisting on confession once a year was only a warning to bad Catholics who were neglecting even that.

As if he were writing to Protestants, St. Augustine said, centuries ago: "Let no man

Confession to God not enough.

among you say: 'I do penance in secret and before God; God who knows that I repent in my heart will pardon me.' Was it said to no purpose: 'Whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven?' Was it to no purpose that the Church received the keys of the kingdom of heaven?"

St. Basil, one of the earliest writers, says: "We must confess our sins to those who are appointed the dispensers of the divine mysteries."

Qualities.

The confession must be sincere; that is, all mortal sins must be confessed, and their number and kind stated as far as, after a careful examination we can recollect. Circumstances changing the nature of the sin must also be manifested.

If a mortal sin has been wilfully concealed, the confession is not valid and must be repeated as well as all the other confessions made after the bad one. If a sin has been forgotten it is enough to confess it in the next confession. Venial sins may be confessed but there is no obligation to do so.

Only priests who are authorized can forgive.

Priests receive the power of absolving, in ordination, but in order to exercise this power validly they must have jurisdiction; that is, permission from the bishop or other prelate who has the right to grant it. Any priest, however, can absolve one who is in imminent danger of death if no other priest with jurisdiction is at hand. Even

in the case of the priest being excommunicated or suspended he would still have that power. In giving jurisdiction, the Pope or bishops may restrict it to certain sins or certain penitents.

Delusions of Protestants.

Mere confession is not enough for absolution. That is one of the delusions which Protestants have about this matter. To be absolved it is necessary to be sincerely sorry for having sinned, to have a firm resolution to avoid sin for the future and to shun the occasions of it, and to repair, as far as possible, any injury which our sins have inflicted upon others. Thus enmities must be laid aside; ill-gotten goods must be restored, and, if that is for the moment impossible, the determination to do so must be had, etc. Unless the confession is accompanied by these dispositions, it is absolutely worthless, and no priestly absolution can be of any avail.

Two kinds of sorrow.

There are two kinds of sorrow, or contrition for sin, perfect and imperfect. The latter is called attrition. Both must contain the aforesaid conditions. The difference between them consists in the motive that prompts the sorrow. If this motive is love of God for His own sake, on account of His infinite goodness, the contrition is perfect. That contrition cancels sin, for true love of God and sin cannot abide together. But it must be borne in mind that, even if it does cancel sin, it does not dispense with the duty of

confession. Imperfect contrition has for its motive the judgments of God, the loss of heaven, the fear of hell. That is enough for confession, and, when joined to the absolution of the priest, obtains remission of sin. (Council of Trent, Ses. xiv. Can. 4.)

Satisfaction.

Satisfaction is enjoined by the priest, and ordinarily consists in almsdeeds, or prayer, or fasting. It is a part of the matter of the sacrament, inasmuch as, on the part of the penitent, it is a firm resolution of accepting and fulfilling it. It should be, as a general rule, performed immediately after the confession and absolution. By means of this penance, part, at least, of the temporal punishment due to sin is remitted.

Indulgences are not permissions to sin.

The paying of the debt of this temporal punishment is greatly facilitated by the gaining of indulgences. Indulgences are not, as some Protestants imagine, permission to commit sin for the future, nor is it even a remission of the guilt of the past. It is merely a total or partial remission of the temporal punishment due to sin after the guilt has been remitted by the Sacrament of Penance. It is granted by the application of the satisfactions of Christ and of the saints, which constitute the spiritual treasure of the Church. The satisfactions of Christ were superabundant and the saints did not need all their satisfactory works for themselves. These superabundant

merits can, by the will of God, be applied by the Church to the faithful who are in need of help to pay their debt to divine justice.

Who grant indulgences.

The Sovereign Pontiff, and to a certain extent the bishops, may give these satisfactory works which the Church has heaped up in her treasury to penitent sinners. The exercise of this power is based on the words of Christ: "Whatsoever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." There is no exception. The term is "whatsoever." Now the debt of temporal punishment is a fetter, a bond, and if the Church looses it on earth it is loosed in heaven. We have an example of it in the action of St. Paul in regard to the man of Corinth guilty of a heinous crime. St. Cyprian tells us that from the earliest time ecclesiastical penances were mitigated at the prayer of those who were about to suffer martyrdom. It is like the prayer of a mother pleading her own merits with the father for the pardon of an erring but repentant son.

For the souls in purgatory.

These indulgences, by the concession of the Sovereign Pontiff, may be applied to the souls in purgatory, but only by the way of intercession for those who are unable to do aught for themselves. It is, however, more than a prayer of intercession, because the Church comes full handed with merits which, though not bound to, God will surely accept in favor of the suffering soul.

CHAPTER V.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

ARTICLE I.

THE SACRAMENT.

Institution of the Blessed Sacrament.

Our divine Lord instituted the Blessed Eucharist the night before He died. Taking bread in His hands, He blessed it, broke it and gave it to His disciples, saying, "Take and eat, for this is My body." In like manner taking the chalice with wine He said: "Drink ye all of this, for this is My blood." [1] It was the greatest gift He could give to men. By that act He became really, truly, and substantially present under the appearances of the bread and wine.

Christ's Promise.

He had already promised this when speaking to the people of Capharnaum as we see in the sixth chapter of St. John. Making a comparison with the manna which the Jews had eaten in the desert He said: "Your fathers did eat manna and did die. The bread which I will give you is such that if any man will eat he shall live forever, and the bread which I will give you is My flesh for the life of the world."

But was He not speaking in a figurative sense?

1. Matt. xxv. 26. Mark xiv. 22.

No, for the Jews understood Him literally and found it "hard" to believe. They debated among themselves saying: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" Instead of saying that He was only speaking figuratively, He reiterated what He had said and in stronger language: "Amen, Amen I say unto you [and that is a most solemn form of speech], unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood you will not have life in you. My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed."

Not a figurative eating.

It is impossible to take those words in any but the strictest sense, for, in the usage of the Hebrews, eating the flesh and drinking the blood of another figuratively, meant to inflict an injury. Christ could not insist upon their doing that. Moreover if it were merely to eat the bread in commemoration of Him, how could it be greater than the manna which had come from heaven and sustained the people during forty years?

Understanding that Christ meant to be taken literally, many went away. Yet, in spite of the desertion of these unbelievers, Christ makes it still harder, and said: "Does this scandalize you? How then, when you shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" Namely, how much harder will it be for you to believe that you are to eat the body of the Son of Man, when He is no longer with you?

Objections of Protestants.

But Protestants say: He did speak figuratively, for it was then He added: "The flesh profiteth nothing; the words which I have spoken to you, are spirit and life." The meaning of these words is: "The dead flesh profiteth nothing; killing Me and eating My flesh, as I now stand before you, would indeed avail you nothing. It is not thus you are to eat Me, but My words, which are spirit and life, will make this living and not dead flesh of mine, to be really and truly eaten by you, not in the bloody manner which you now imagine, but in a way that I shall tell you afterwards." It was for that reason that St. Peter, answering for the others when Christ asked them: Will you, too, go away? said: "Thou hast the words of eternal life." That is to say, we do not understand, O Lord, but because of Thy words, which cannot deceive us, we believe. In that same spirit do we Catholics answer: We do not understand, O Lord, but because Thou hast said it, we believe.

Christ fulfilled this promise made at Capharnaum when He instituted the Blessed Sacrament at the Last Supper.

That the Apostles then also understood that those words were to be taken literally, is seen from St. Paul I. Cor. x. 16, where he says that the partaking of the Holy Eucharist is the communion of the body and blood of Christ. In the

eleventh chapter he tells us that "he who eateth or drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation, not discerning the body of the Lord." Now, the mere eating of a piece of bread, which was meant only to commemorate Christ's death, could not be the awful crime that St. Paul gave us to understand it to be. It must be because the unworthy communicant really profaned the body and blood of Christ by receiving Him while the soul was in a state of sin.

Real presence always believed by the Church.

That the Church has always believed in the real presence is clear. It is only necessary to turn to the most ancient liturgies of the Church, and even to those of the early schismatics and heretics of the East to find the proof of it. It is unnecessary to quote any of the Fathers of the Church whose writings teem with evidence on this point.

The early law of secrecy.

In the early Church there was a law of secrecy so rigidly observed with regard to the Holy Eucharist that not even the catechumens were allowed to be present at the holy sacrifice. The words: *Ite missa est*, are like those formerly used in dismissing them. That secrecy is a clear proof of what the belief of the early Christian was. They preached openly all the other doctrines of the Church to the heathen world. They feared misunderstanding about the Eucharist. Now if it was a figurative eating of Christ, there

would be no reason for their secrecy. But because the Pagans had said that the Christians used to eat a child in their assemblies, thus perverting the idea of the eating of the body of Christ, it was deemed safer to say nothing about that doctrine at all. But as has been said, this silence is a proof of what their belief was.

What the words do.

Catholics hold, therefore, that at the time of the consecration, the whole substance of the bread is changed into the substance of the body of our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into His most precious blood. But as Christ's body is a living body, under the accidents or external appearances of bread there are present also the blood, the soul and the divinity; and under the appearance of wine there is not only the blood but also the body and soul and divinity. In other words under both He is whole and entire.

Christ's body not broken in the Eucharist.

When the Sacred Host is broken it is not the body of Christ which is broken, but only what appears exteriorly. Christ is whole and entire in the whole host and in every part of it, before and after it is divided. The presence of Christ in the Sacred Host lasts as long as the external appearances remain unaltered or incorrupted.

Wheaten bread and wine of the grape.

The matter of this sacrament is wheaten bread, whether leavened or unleavened, and wine made from the juice of the grape.

The form is the words of Christ pronounced

by the priest who represents Him at the altar: "This is my body, this is my blood, etc."

Only bishops and priests have the power of consecrating the body and blood of our Lord.

ARTICLE II.

THE MASS

The Holy Eucharist is not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice.

Sacrifice is destruction.

A SACRIFICE in the strict sense of the word is a visible gift offered to God, and wholly or partially destroyed in sign of worship. This destruction may be only equivalent destruction, as when a thing is reduced to some lower condition than what is natural to it, or when it is made unfit for further use. Thus, for example, David poured out the water on the ground as a sacrifice to God.[1]

The highest form of worship.

By this destruction or quasi-destruction God's supreme dominion is acknowledged and hence can be offered to God alone. It is restricted to Him also because it is the highest kind of worship.

Men always worshiped by sacrifice.

God was worshiped by sacrifice from the beginning. Thus Cain and Abel offered sacrifice. The first act of Noah on coming from the Ark was to offer sacrifice. In all nations and at all times

1. II. Kings xxiii. 13.

men endeavored, sometimes indeed in the most hideous fashion, to express their subjection to the Deity in that manner.

In the Mosaic Law God Himself assigned the victims and enjoined the ceremonies of the sacrifices. It follows, therefore, that in the New Law, which sums up all the past and for which all the past was a preparation, this same kind of worship should be paid. The people of God, viz., the Church, should have the greatest sacrifice. That sacrifice is the Mass.

The Church's sacrifice foretold.

The sacrifice of the New Law was foretold by Malachy (i. 2.) in these words: "From the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, My name is great among the Gentiles and in every place (and consequently not to be restricted to Calvary) there is a sacrifice and there is offered in My name a clean oblation." All this describes the sacrifice of the Mass and has always been regarded as foretelling it.

Established by Christ.

Christ instituted that sacrifice at the Last Supper when, after having consecrated the bread and wine He said: "Do this in commemoration of Me." This word "do" from immemorial usage in religious matters among the Hebrews signifies nothing else than sacrifice.

Offered in the early Church.

St. Paul speaks of the Christian altar.[1] Why an altar if there is no sacrifice? In the Acts of the

1. Heb. xiii. 10.

Apostles,[1] they are described as offering sacrifice before sending Paul and Barnabas on their mission. The expression is "ministering" in the English text, but the Greek leaves no doubt of the meaning. All the ancient liturgies (remark that "liturgy" means the set forms of sacrificial ceremony), contain directions and prayers for the celebration of the Mass. The Eastern heretics, separated from the Church now more than fourteen centuries, hold to this day that the Mass is the true Christian sacrifice. Protestants were the first to have religious service without the supreme act of worship which God always exacted from His rational creatures.

The Mass is a true sacrifice.

The sacrifice of the Mass is a true sacrifice because it reduces Christ, the Son of God, to that humiliating condition to which He has vouchsafed to descend, viz., existing under the species of the commonest kind of food that men use for bodily sustenance. It is not destruction because Christ can no longer die, but it is quasi-destruction. He has, as it were, annihilated Himself: *exinanivit se.*

Also a representation of Calvary.

Besides being a true sacrifice, the Holy Mass renews in its unbloody offering, the memory of the bloody sacrifice of Calvary. They are the same except in the manner of offering. In both, there is the same victim, the same High Priest,

1. Acts xiii. 2.

Christ Jesus, (the priest at the altar being merely the representative) and the blood-shedding of Calvary is recalled and represented by the separate consecrations of the bread and of the wine; symbolizing thus the separation of the blood from the body as it took place on the cross.

Man's obligations fulfilled best by the Mass.

By the Mass, more than by any other act, can man fulfil his obligation of adoring and thanking God. By no other is he better able to atone for his transgressions and obtain the temporal and spiritual helps he stands in need of. The reason is that in the Mass Christ adores and thanks, applies His merits and intercedes with the Father for us.

Use of Latin.

In the Western Church the language employed is Latin. This is done advisedly. Modern and living languages change, and words in the course of years take on different meanings. As the liturgy must be guarded from any possibility of misinterpretation, a dead language, one, namely, which is no longer in use, and which, therefore, does not change, is employed. The people, however, know perfectly well what is taking place. It is not necessary for them to hear the words. They are there participating in a great act of worship.

Objections of Protestants.

The objections to considering the Mass as a sacrifice are as follows:

Did not St. Paul say that now there is only one

sacrifice, viz., the sacrifice of the cross? He certainly did say so, and, therefore, the old sacrifices of the Temple, in which oxen and sheep, etc., were offered, have been forever done away with. We say as St. Paul says, there is only *one* sacrifice now, viz., the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. But that may be offered many times, and will be offered till the end of the world, as we see from the prophecy of Malachy.

But St. Paul said it would be offered once! We answer that the *bloody* sacrifice would be offered once, but St. Paul makes it plain that the unbloody one would be offered constantly, else why speak of the Christian altar?

Nevertheless, some Protestants still urge that this seems derogatory to the merits of Christ. Was His death on the Cross not sufficient for the salvation of the world? More than sufficient, but that blood which was shed had to be applied to our souls. For that reason has the sacrifice of the Mass been instituted by Christ to draw from His infinite merits and apply them to our souls. His death on Calvary gained all the merits. His mystical death on the altar makes them of avail for us.

CHAPTER VI.

EXTREME UNCTION.

Purpose.

Extreme Unction is the sacrament of the dying. By the anointing with oil and the prayer of the priest, they receive the grace to die well, or, in some cases, to recover their bodily health and strength.

Instituted by Christ

It is of divine origin, as we see in the Epistle of St. James.[1] "Is any one sick among you, let him call in the priest of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith will save the sick man, and the Lord will raise him up, and if he be in sin, they shall be forgiven him."

Always used.

We have here an external sign, evidently established by Christ, for only He could establish this connection between matter and supernatural grace. Tradition testifies to its existence in the Church from the beginning, and all the separated Eastern sects still adhere to it.

Effects.

The special effects of the sacrament are the remission of venial sin, and, in some circumstances, even mortal sin; also the removal of what are called the vestiges of sin, namely, darkness of intellect, weakness of will, etc., and the

1. St. James v. 41.

giving of fortitude in suffering, and strength in resisting temptation. Sometimes, also, it restores the sick person to health.

Minister

The minister of the sacrament is the priest. It can be given but once in the same sickness. But if the patient recovers, it is to be given again when the danger of death recurs.

CHAPTER VII.

HOLY ORDERS.

God established a priesthood in the Jewish Church. So has He done in the Church for which the old covenant was a preparation and a type.

There must be a priesthood.

As we have seen, Christ instituted a sacrifice in the New Law. But a sacrifice always supposes a priest.

Priest's powers.

Besides this right to offer the Holy Sacrifice, the priests have other powers, such as forgiving sins, anointing the dying, etc. How are those powers to be transmitted? Not by any ceremony or rite which the priests themselves might institute. As all of those powers surpass everything that nature could attain to, it would be impossible for a mere man to connect them with some material thing or ceremony. That must be done by Christ. Hence the sacrament of Holy Orders must be of divine institution.

How conferred.

What is the ceremony of ordination? The imposing of hands. In the Acts of the Apostles Chapter xiv. we read that the Apostles went forth "ordaining" everywhere. If we look at the Greek text we shall find that the word "ordaining" is a translation of "imposing hands," which makes the matter clear at once.

Effects.

This rite of imposing hands not only confers the powers of the priesthood but also an increase of sanctifying grace, as well as special graces to exercise the priestly duties in a worthy manner. Thus St. Paul writes to Timothy :[1] "I admonish thee to stir up the grace which is in thee by the imposition of my hands."

Ministers.

The minister of this sacrament is the bishop, who alone can confer priesthood. By a special delegation of the Pope, a priest can confer minor orders.

Grades in Orders.

There are in the Church several orders, bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectors and doorkeepers. The order of the bishop is the plenitude of the priesthood, superior to that of the priests, for besides the priestly power they have the right to ordain both priests and bishops. Deaconship and subdeaconship are enumerated among the higher orders. The others are called minor orders. The closer their relation is to the holy sacrifice, the greater is their dignity.

Seal.

This sacrament imprints an indelible character on the soul, and hence can be received only once.

Anglican Orders.

Orders conferred by heretical bishops are valid, provided they are conferred according to a rite approved by the Church, and with the intention of doing what the Church does. Because

1. II. Tim. i. 6.

of the absence of these two elements, Anglican orders are not valid, as Pope Leo XIII. has decided. Protestant ministers who call themselves priests, have no right to the title.

Heretics have no right to govern.

Even if heretical or schismatical bishops did fulfil those two conditions, they could not confer any jurisdiction or right to exercise their ministry upon those they ordain. All such rights are derived from the Sovereign Pontiff. He being the supreme head, no one can govern any part of the flock but with his approval. History testifies that not only the bishops of the West, but even the patriarchs of Antioch, Peter's first See, had to obtain papal confirmation in order to lawfully exercise their ministry.

To the question "Why do priests lead a life of celibacy?" we answer:

Why priests do not marry.

1. Because the Jewish priests during the time they were appointed to offer sacrifices in the Temple, lived chaste. The priesthood of the new dispensation is nobler, and offers the divine sacrifice perpetually. Therefore they observe perpetual chastity.

2. Because they wish to imitate our Divine Lord and the Apostles.

3. A married priesthood could never carry the gospel to savage nations and face sufferings and death for Christ. Only those who are espoused to Him can do that.

CHAPTER VIII.

MATRIMONY.

Matrimony is the permanent union between husband and wife for the propagation of the human race and the education of their offspring.

No polygamy or divorce.

In the beginning, neither polygamy nor divorce was allowed, as our Lord testifies.[1] After the Deluge, polygamy was not forbidden, and, in the Jewish law, divorce in certain specified cases was sanctioned.

Christ abolished both polygamy and divorce, as we may see in the chapter just referred to. Even in the case of infidelity to the marriage vow and a consequent separation, another marriage on the part of either husband or wife is stigmatized by our Saviour as adultery.

Always the doctrine of the Church.

This has always been the doctrine of the Church. The Eastern Church professed the same doctrine until her separation from the centre of Christian unity. After that she began to grant divorces in certain cases. If the Church ever grants what seems to be a divorce, it is because, from the beginning, the marriage was null and void. The Church merely declares that nullity, but she cannot grant a divorce.

Christ not only restored marriage to its primi-

1. Matt. xix. 4.

The Church's elevation of marriage.

tive purity but raised it to the dignity of a sacrament. He made it represent His own mystical union with the Church[1] and wished the love of husband and wife to be like that which He has for the Church and which the Church entertains for Him.

The Church has always regarded it as a sacrament. The rituals of all the churches, both East and West, bear testimony to that.

Who are its ministers.

The parties contracting marriage are the ministers of the sacrament. The priest is only the accredited and legal witness and imparts the Church's blessing to the married couple.

Impediments.

The Church has a right to establish certain impediments to marriage and, for wise reasons, adds hers to those which are fixed by the law of God. These impediments may be such as to make the marriage contract invalid, *i. e.*, null and void, or may merely make them unlawful.

Dispensations.

As the Church has the power to establish impediments to marriage she can likewise give a dispensation from them if she judges the reasons sufficient.

Mixed marriages.

Marriage between Catholic and non-Catholic, or mixed marriages as they are called, the Church has ever regarded with detestation. When she grants a dispensation for them, she does so with

1. Eph. v. 22.

repugnance and regret. It is only to avoid greater sin. She always imposes the conditions: that the non-Catholic will not interfere with the practice of the other's religion, and that the children shall be brought up in the Catholic faith.

As a general rule such marriages even with dispensations are unfortunate. It establishes a division between husband and wife in what, after all, is the most important thing of life, viz., the right way to save their souls. The children are taught to set little value on religion by seeing their parents disagree about it; and the Church has to mourn countless thousands who are lost to her because of these marriages.

A. M. D. G.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

The Church 7
Its Marks 9
Found only in the Catholic Church 14
Indefectibility 21
Infallibility 23
Primacy of Peter 26
Peter's Successor 28
Infallibility of the Pope 29
The Creed.
God 34
Trinity 37
Creation 39
Natural World. 39
Angels 40
Man 41
Christ 46
God 47
Man 48
His Mother 49
His Sufferings 51
His Resurrection 52
Communion of Saints 55
Purgatory 58
Body's Resurrection 60
Heaven and Hell 61
Sacraments.
In General 65
Baptism 70
Confirmation 74
Penance 75
Holy Eucharist.
Sacrament 82
Sacrifice 87
Extreme Unction 92
Holy Orders 94
Marriage 97

WHAT CHRIST REVEALED.

REV. L. JOUIN, S.J.,
St. John's College, FORDHAM, N. Y.

10,000 Copies Sold in Two Months.

PRESS NOTICES OF FATHER JOUIN'S WORK.

A very timely and useful work, in view of the disputes that are going on at present in many Protestant circles regarding the character and extent of divine revelations, is that which Rev. L. Jouin, S.J., of St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y., has issued in pamphlet form, entitled "What Christ Revealed." Father Jouin writes in an attractive manner, and he has managed to crowd a wonderful amount of information into the hundred pages of this little book, and by means of marginal titles that appear on every page, that information is presented in a way to catch the eye, or to be readily found. "What Christ Revealed" is printed on good, thick paper, sells for ten cents a copy, and is approved by the Archbishop of New York. It ought to command a large sale.—*The Sacred Heart Review.*

The Venerable Father Jouin, S.J., has condensed into one hundred small pages a statement of "What Christ Revealed." The two chief merits of this brochure are the excellent judgment shown in selecting topics most frequently introduced by non-Catholics, and the brief but perfectly satisfactory way in which they are disposed of.

For an illustration, we cannot do better than to quote Father Jouin's answer to the objection that Papal Infallibility interferes with one's liberty: "It does not any more than the warning of a guide in the mountains interferes with your liberty when he prevents you from falling over a precipice." This pamphlet will help all who read it, whether they be Catholics or not. Published by St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y. Price, ten cents. —*The Ave Maria.*

"What Christ Revealed" is the title of a little pamphlet by the Rev. L. Jouin, S. J., of St. John's College, Fordham, intended partly for use in the instructions given at missions, and partly as a school and college manual. The Church, the Creed and the Sacraments are its three divisions. It is succinctly written and marginal notes facilitate reference to any desired passage. Father Jouin's energetic and occasionally humorous manner makes the book one of the best of its kind, and its nominal price of ten cents indicates that St. John's College has no intention of allowing any Laodicean or any sinner the excuse that he cannot afford a good doctrinal book. (Sacred Heart Library, No. 29 W. Sixteenth Street, New York.)—*The Pilot.*

"What Christ Revealed" is the title of a work by Rev. L. Jouin, S. J., Fordham, N. Y. The book is divided into three parts: 1st, "The Church that Teaches;" 2d, "The Creed that is Taught;" 3d, "The Sacraments that Sanctify." The volume is worth its weight in gold, although the price is only ten cents.—*Western Catholic News.*

The following letter from the Editor of the *Church Calendar* of West Virginia gives a convert's opinion of the book:

WHEELING, W. VA., April 3, 1897.

REV. L. JOUIN, S.J., Fordham, N. Y.

Rev. and Dear Father:

Some time ago we received your work, "What Christ Revealed." At the time, I had not the opportunity of giving it my personal attention. I read it over last week and consider it a magnificent work. As I am a convert myself, I can appreciate it. I almost constantly have converts on hand for instruction, and I feel this work will be a valuable assistance.

We know no book that tells so well within a hundred pages what Christ has revealed about the Church that teaches, the Creed that is taught, and the Sacraments that sanctify.

Solid argument is conveyed in the clearest and briefest terms. It is worthy of a very wide circulation, and the price (ten cents) is certainly not prohibitive.—*The Irish Monthly.*

Father Jouin has the rare faculty of condensation, of putting a great deal of information in small space. It gives a summary of what constitutes the faith of a Catholic. "What Christ Revealed" is an excellent book for a Catholic to lend to his Protestant neighbor, who wants to know in a few words what Catholics believe.—*The Catholic Record.*

This little book is intended to be a brief but reasoned exposition of the principal doctrines which constitute the faith of a Catholic. A perusal of its pages proves how well the author carried out his intention.

The author covers the entire field of Catholic doctrine. He moves rapidly from point to point, stating briefly the Church's teaching, and assigning pithy reasons as he goes, answering difficulties and objections, and noting the chief heresies. As an example of Father Jouin's swift, clear style, we may cite the following: . . .

Every page of this little book teems at once with sound teaching and interesting instruction. It will meet with a ready welcome among all classes of Catholics, and finds

its place equally in the home and in the Sunday school. Put into the hands of busy Protestants, it should be the means of dispelling many errors, and of awakening further inquiry into the faith it so clearly portrays. Its value is further enhanced by marginal notes, which give the gist of each paragraph. The price, ten cents, should make it popular.—*American Ecclesiastical Review.*

Rev. Louis Jouin, Professor of Ethics in St. John's College, Fordham, N. Y., has written an admirable exposition of the truths of faith under the title of "What Christ Revealed." Written in a strong, convincing style, this little book is destined to do much good.—*Donahoe's Magazine.*

This book is a timely contribution to the needs of the day. It is a clear, concise and convincing exposition of the principal doctrines of our faith. It shows the handiwork of an experienced teacher, and is one of the most useful and practical books for Catholics to give an answer to inquiring friends outside the Church. They can arm themselves with short but conclusive proofs for all the doctrines of the faith.—*Carmelite Review.*

It is surprising how many things are put into these 100 pages. The book would have been valuable if the Romanism had been omitted.—*The Arrow* (*Protestant-Episcopal*).

From 12 to 100 Copies - - -	$7.00 per 100
From 100 to 500 Copies - - -	6.50 per 100
From 500 to 1000 Copies - - -	6.00 per 100
From 1000 or more Copies - - -	5.00 per 100

Address

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE,
FORDHAM, N. Y., or

THE SACRED HEART LIBRARY,
27 and 29 West Sixteenth Street,
NEW YORK CITY.

944

238.1
J 57

94

AUTHOR

Louis Jouin, S.J.

TITLE

What Christ Revealed